

REMARKS

I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. Claim 32 and Corresponding New Claim 61

In the parent application, the Examiner rejected independent claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,857,309 ("the Cicha patent"), in view of the U.S. Patent No. 4,680,163 ("the Blidschun patent"). This rejected claim corresponds to new claim 61. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 61. The present invention claims a temperature control system for heating the photosensitizer with waste heat from a light source. In the present invention, this light source is used for illuminating the sprayed contaminated surface. While the Cicha patent discloses the use of a light source, it does not teach heating the photosensitizer (hydrogen peroxide solution). The Blidschun patent teaches the use of heated air or gas to warm the walls through which the sterilizing agent passes to prevent condensation. (Col. 6, lines 28-41). However, the Blidschun patent does not disclose a light source for illuminating the sprayed contaminated surface, and therefore, does not teach heating the sterilizing agent with the waste heat from a light source. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that neither the Cicha patent nor the Blidschun patent suggest the use of waste heat from a light source to heat the photosensitizer. Accordingly, applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 61.

B. Claims 33-37 and Corresponding New Claims 62-66

In the parent application, the Examiner rejected independent claim 33-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the Cicha patent in view of the Blidschun patent. These

rejected claims correspond to new claims 62 through 66. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claim 62 and dependent claims 63-66.

Claim 62 has been amended to recite that the barrier is “portable”.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither reference cited by the Examiner teaches or suggests the use or application of a “portable barrier” as claimed in amended claim 62. The Cicha patent provides no suggestion or motivation for the use of a “portable barrier” as claimed, as it is directed to a sterilization stations which may be surrounded by sidewalls (Col. 3, lines 61-62) which are not described as portable. Moreover, the Blidschun patent does not disclose any type of barrier other than a cavity into which the containers to be sterilized are placed (Col. 6, lines 56-58), and therefore, provides no suggestion or motivation for the use of a “portable barrier” as claimed. Accordingly, applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 62-66, especially as claim 62 has been amended to more clearly define the subject matter of the invention.

II. Allowable Subject Matter in Parent Application

In the parent application, the Examiner allowed rejected claims 18-19 and claims 39-40 which correspond to new claims 59-60 and 67-68, respectively.

III. Conclusion


Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the independent and dependent claims are allowable over the prior art of record.

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present

application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner disagrees, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided so that an interview may be scheduled.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

12-31-2003 

By: Grant D. Kang, Esq. Reg. No. 37,651
Husch & Eppenberger, LLC
190 Carondelet Plaza
St. Louis, MO 63105
314-480-1640
314-480-1505 FAX